


NA3
11: H42
C.2

North Carolina State Library
Raleigh

N. C.
Doc.



Housing Work Element Haywood County, North Carolina



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
State Library of North Carolina

<https://archive.org/details/housingworkeleme1973unse>

HOUSING WORK ELEMENT FOR HAYWOOD COUNTY

Prepared For:

Haywood County, North Carolina

Board of County Commissioners

Harold D. Long, Chairman

Frank D. Bradshaw

William R. Allen

Prepared By:

Haywood County Planning Board

Kenneth Muse

Joe Haynes

Neil McKinnish

Joe Medford

Raymond Miller

Ed Williams

Betty Fender

Ed Duckworth

George Trostel

Jim Winfred

Helen Lankford

Two members representing

Hazelwood

Technical Assistance Provided By:

State of North Carolina, Department of
Natural and Economic Resources
Division of Community Services

Harold Strong, Administrator

Western Area Office, Asheville
North Carolina

Michael Geouge, Area Director

Martha Ramsey, Community Development Specialist

Hermon Rector, Draftsman

Larry Israel, Draftsman

Marie Gantt, Stenographer

Millie Wilson, Stenographer

HOUSING WORK ELEMENT FOR
HAYWOOD COUNTY

April 1973

The preparation of this report was financed in part through an urban planning grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under the provision of Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 as amended.

Preface

The Housing Act of 1949 established as its goal "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." This objective is far from reality today. The problem of providing a quantity of standard housing sufficient to meet present and expected demands for housing is becoming increasingly greater with the passage of time. Housing and housing-related problems can be overcome through the combined efforts of government and private enterprise working in conjunction with the local citizens.

The objective of this study is to examine the quality of the existing housing stock, relate various factors which influence housing to the projected future housing needs within Haywood County, and recommend future planning activities and implementation actions which are aimed at generally improving the housing environment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
I. THE SUPPLY OF HOUSING IN HAYWOOD COUNTY.....	3
Tenure	3
Quality of Housing	4
Crowding	8
Unit Size	9
Value and Rent	10
Mobile Homes	11
II. DEMAND FOR HOUSING IN HAYWOOD COUNTY.....	13
Population and Household Growth	14
Employment and Income	15
Housing Demand	18
Housing Need	20
Total Housing Requirements	21
III. FACTORS INHIBITING OPERATION OF THE HOUSING MARKET.....	23
Restrictive Building and Housing Codes	23
Zoning Enforcement	23
Obstructions Within the Tax Structure	24
Failure of the Filtering Process	24
Land Speculation	25
Public Facilities and Services	26
Impact of Inflation	26
Lack of Mortgage Financing	27

IV.	PUBLIC EFFORTS.....	28
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE HOUSING SITUATION.....	30
	Eliminate Incompatible Land Use	30
	Regulate Subdivision Development	31
	Conserve Sound Structures and Assure Quality Construction	31
	Rehabilitate Deteriorated Structures	32
	Remove Dilapidated Structures	32
	Other Redevelopment Actions	33
	Providing Dwellings All Families Can Afford	33
	SUMMARY.....	36
	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Estimated Current Housing Units By Race and Tenure of Occupancy, Haywood County, 1970.....	3
2.	Estimated Number of Housing Units, Haywood County, 1972.....	6
3.	Unit Size, Haywood County, 1970.....	9
4.	Breakdown of Current Households by Value and Rent, Haywood County, 1970.....	10
5.	Utilization of Mobile Homes in Haywood County.....	12
6.	Population Growth, Haywood County, 1950-1980.....	14
7.	Household Growth and Number of Elderly Household, Haywood County, 1970-1980.....	15
8.	Employment, Haywood County, 1962-1971.....	16
9.	Family Income, Haywood County, 1970.....	17
10.	Estimated 1980 Distribution of Households by Income and Number of Persons, Haywood County.....	18
11.	Estimated 1980 Renter Households with Adequate Incomes by Monthly Shelter Cost and Number of Persons (Renter Demand), Haywood County.....	19
12.	Estimated 1980 Owner Households with Adequate Incomes by Housing Value and Number of Persons (Owner Demand) Haywood County Housing Value (1970 Dollars).....	20
13.	Estimated 1980 Households with Inadequate Incomes by Maximum Monthly Shelter Cost and Number of Persons (Housing Need) Haywood County.....	21
14.	Gross Housing Demand Estimated 1980, Haywood County.....	22

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Illustration

1. Residential Structural Conditions, Haywood County,
Urban Area..... 39
2. Residential Structural Conditions, Haywood County,
Rural Area..... 40

INTRODUCTION

Haywood County, located in the Blue Ridge Province of the Appalachian Complex, was organized from Buncombe County in 1808. It originally extended from the western edge of the Blue Ridge Mountains on the east to the crest of the Great Smoky Mountains, a territory which has since been divided into seven counties.

It now contains 543 square miles characterized primarily by steep mountainous terrain which is dissected by numerous valleys. The highest peak is Mt. Guyot (6,621 feet) and the lowest point is at Waterville (1,400 feet). These two points are approximately ten airline miles apart.¹

In recent decades, manufacturing has gained increasing importance in Haywood County. Approximately forty percent of the employed persons in the county in 1971 held jobs in the manufacturing industry.² The average weekly wage of persons working in the county is one of the highest in North Carolina.

Haywood County is divided into thirteen townships and has four incorporated towns, Waynesville, Canton, Hazelwood, and Clyde. In 1970 approximately thirty-five percent of the county's population maintained their residences and forty-four percent of the county's housing units were located within the corporate limits of these four towns.

Approximately 29.4 percent of the housing units within Haywood County are substandard,³ 12.0 percent lack some or all plumbing facilities and 7.1 percent are overcrowded.⁴

¹ Sharpe, A New Geography of North Carolina, p.176.

² N. C. Employment Security Commission.

³ Division of Community Services estimated from housing survey.

⁴ U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Housing: 1970, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Final Report, North Carolina.

It is hoped that this study will provide information, which can be used to improve the living environment of the residents of Haywood County and to ensure that all families within the county are provided a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling regardless of income.

I. THE SUPPLY OF HOUSING

IN HAYWOOD COUNTY

Housing supply refers to the number of units existing, whether occupied or vacant, in a given area at a given time.

Adequacy of a community's housing supply is determined by an evaluation of the tenure, condition, persons per room, unit size, and cost.

Tenure

Tenure refers to the rental or owner occupancy of housing units. In 1970, 75.1 percent of the housing units in Haywood County were occupied by owners. Home ownership is most common among white households in the United States. Within Haywood County, however, the rate of home ownership is nearly as prevalent among non-white households (Table 1).

TABLE 1
ESTIMATED CURRENT HOUSING UNITS BY
RACE AND TENURE OF OCCUPANCY
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1970

	Number of Units
Owner Occupied Units	
White	9,793
Negro	<u>147</u>
Subtotal	9,940
Renter Occupied Units	
White	3,223
Negro	52
Other	<u>13</u>
Subtotal	3,288
Vacant Year Round	
For Sale Only	141
Vacant less than 6 months	107
Median price	\$9,900

TABLE 1 -- Continued

	Number of Units
For Rent	341
Vacant Less than 2 Months	121
Median Price	\$49
Other Vacant	<u>708</u>
Total Vacant	1,180
TOTAL YEAR-ROUND UNITS	14,418

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Housing: 1970, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Final Report, North Carolina.

Quality of Housing

One of the most important characteristics of the supply of housing is quality. Of primary concern is substandard housing. In order to determine if substandard housing is a problem in Haywood County, it is necessary to define housing conditions generally considered substandard, and determine the number of substandard houses and the degree of their deterioration.

Exterior structural conditions in Haywood County were surveyed by the Division of Community Services in November 1972, rating all structures, using three classifications.

Standard. --Structures which have no defects or only slight defects which are correctable during regular maintenance.

Deteriorated: - Structures having defects which require major repair to prevent further deterioration.

Dilapidated: - Structures which are unfit and unsafe for human occupancy. Such housing has one or more critical defects which are beyond economical repair. The term substandard, as used in this study

encompasses housing of deteriorated and dilapidated condition.

Within Haywood County 29.44 percent of the residential structures are substandard, 22.68 percent are rated as deteriorated, and 6.76 percent are dilapidated. Table 2 indicates the total number and the percentage distribution by condition of residential structures in each of the municipalities and the unincorporated area of the county.

Substandard housing in Haywood County is for the most part scattered. However, there are heavy concentrations in some areas. The eastern and western sections of Waynesville, central area of Hazelwood, and the northwestern, northeastern, and southwestern parts of Canton contain concentrated areas of substandard housing. Most substandard housing in the county is located on roads where only eight to ten houses have been constructed. Large numbers of substandard dwellings also appear in areas where conflicting land usage is a major problem. Illustrations 1 and 2 indicate the approximate spatial distribution of these structures.

Housing becomes substandard for many reasons. Poor original construction and lack of proper maintenance are two major factors. However, much more is involved than just poor construction and maintenance. Substandard dwellings are a problem in and of themselves, but more than this they are symptoms of a much broader problem. The environment in which housing is located is vital to its existence. Such factors as incompatible land use, lack of community facilities, land speculation, poor subdivision development, and the inadequate income of families lead to deterioration.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS

HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1972

Area	Standard Units	% of Total ^a	Deterior- ated Units	% of Total ^a	Dila- pidated Units	% of Total ^a	Total Excluding Mobile Homes	Mobile Home Units	Total
<hr/>									
Canton									
Single-Family	869		506		60		1,435		1,435
Multi-Family	154		92		—		246		246
Mobile Homes	—		—		—		—	34	—
Subtotal	1,023	60.86	598	35.57	60	3.57	1,681	34	1,715
<hr/>									
Clyde									
Single-Family	207		43		8		258		258
Multi-Family	34		5		—		39	27	39
Mobile Homes	—		—		—		—	—	27
Subtotal	241	81.15	48	16.16	8	2.69	297	27	324
<hr/>									
Hazelwood									
Single-Family	282		150		35		567		567
Multi-Family	20		6		—		26	52	26
Mobile Homes	—		—		—		—	—	—
Subtotal	402	67.79	156	26.31	35	5.90	593	52	645

^a Percent of total excluding mobile home units.

Area	Standard Units	% of Total ^a	Deterior- ated Units	% of Total ^a	Dila- pidated Units	% of Total ^a	Total Excluding Mobile Homes	Mobile Home Units	Total
Waynesville									
Single-Family	1,800		502		98		2,400		2,400
Multi-Family	178		53				231		231
Mobile Homes								35	
Subtotal	1,978	75.18	555	21.09	98	3.73	2,631	35	2,666
Unincorporated Area									
Single-Family	5,551		1,321		635		7,507		7,507
Multi-Family	11		2				13		13
Mobile Homes								979	
Subtotal	5,562	73.96	1,323	17.59	635	8.45	7,520	979	8,499
TOTAL UNITS	9,826	70.56	3,158	22.68	942	6.76	13,926	1,159	15,085

^a Percent of total excluding mobile home units.

Source: North Carolina Division of Community Services, Field Survey (November, 1972).
 North Carolina Division of Community Services, Housing Element Update for Canton, North Carolina
 (February, 1972).
 North Carolina Division of Community Services, Updated Housing Element for Waynesville, North
Carolina (March, 1972).

The loss of creative, imaginative individuals who have been stifled in the development of their will or ability to participate as fully productive members of society because of substandard living conditions is incalculable. Housing which is uninviting, unsanitary or indeed, unsafe imposes economic and sociological costs which sap community welfare and unity. Such conditions serve not only to depress the present generation but also to perpetuate poverty.

Crowding

The number of persons per room provides a measure of the utilization of housing. Units with more than one person per room are considered crowded. It is generally accepted that 1.51 or more persons per room represents severe crowding.

Approximately 1.4 percent of the dwelling units in Haywood County were classified as severely overcrowded in 1970. A total of 1,078 housing units (7.1 percent) had an occupancy rate of over 1.01 persons per room. This compared with 10.18 percent for the state as a whole.⁵

The ill effects of overcrowding have long been established; however, the psychological effects related to such an environment are not nearly so well documented nor understood. It appears these effects may be far more detrimental to the individual than those of a physical nature. A perception of oneself that leads to pessimism and passivity; stress to which the individual cannot adapt; poor health and a state of dissatisfaction; pleasure in company but not in solitude; cynicism about people and organizations; difficulty in

⁵ U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Housing: 1970, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Final Report, North Carolina.

household management and child rearing; and external relationships rather than deep internal or family relationships are examples of some of the maladjustments related to overcrowded conditions within the home.

Unit Size

The importance of size of houses or apartments lies primarily in its use as a measure of the adequacy of dwelling units to satisfy the requirements of families of various sizes and composition and as a basis for projecting future unit size requirements in an area. The median number of rooms is 5.0 for housing units in Haywood County. Table 3 gives a breakdown by the number of dwelling units of various sizes.

TABLE 3
UNIT SIZE
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1970

Rooms	Number of Units
1 room	88
2 rooms	243
3 rooms	881
4 rooms	3,531
5 rooms	4,990
6 rooms	2,740
7 rooms	1,082
8 rooms or more	863

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Housing: 1970, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Final Report, North Carolina.

Value and Rent

The median value of owner-occupied dwelling units within Haywood County was \$13,400 in 1970. A total of 8 percent of the owner-occupied dwelling units were in the low-value bracket of less than \$5,000 and 24 percent were in the high-value brackets of \$20,000 or more (see Table 4).

The value of housing has been increasing significantly in recent years. In 1950 the median value of owner-occupied units in the county was \$4,799.

Part of this increase in value has been caused by the higher cost of many new units built during the last two decades. The high price of new housing has also encouraged the price of existing units on the market to rise.

Within the study area, the median monthly rent in 1970 was \$51. Approximately 53 percent of the rental housing units rented for between \$40 and \$100. Over a fifth were in the low-rental bracket of less than \$40 and 6 percent were in the high-rental bracket of \$100 or more (see Table 4).

TABLE 4
BREAKDOWN OF CURRENT
HOUSEHOLDS BY VALUE AND RENT
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1970

		Number of Units
<hr/>		
Owner occupied		
Value		
Under \$5,000		592
\$5,000-\$9,999		1,699
\$10,000-\$14,999		1,947
\$15,000-\$19,999		1,364
\$20,000-\$24,999		866
\$25,000-\$34,999		685
\$35,000 or more		237
Median	\$13,400	
TOTAL		<hr/> 17,390

TABLE 4 -- Continued

			Number of Units
<hr/>			
Renter Occupied			
Contract Rent			
Less than \$30			350
\$30-\$39			321
\$40-\$59			961
\$60-\$79			460
\$80-\$99			107
\$100-\$149			147
\$150 or more			35
No cash rent			481
Median		\$51	
	TOTAL		<u>2,862</u>

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census: Census of Housing: 1970, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Final Report, North Carolina.

Mobile Homes

In recent years the mobile home industry has become the fastest growing segment of the housing market. At present, approximately 7.7 percent of all housing units in Haywood County are mobile homes. By 1980, 2,013 mobile homes are expected to be used as housing units in the county (see Table 5). If properly inspected as required by the North Carolina General Statutes and regulated in regard to lot size, foundation, water and sewer, mobile homes can provide a safe and decent place to live which can be obtained at a lower cost than conventional housing.

TABLE 5

UTILIZATION OF MOBILE HOMES IN HAYWOOD COUNTY,
1970-1980

Number of Mobile Home Units		Mobile Home Units as a Percentage of Total Inventory	
1970	Estimated 1980	1970	Estimated 1980
1,159	2,013	7.7	11.2

Source: Division of Community Services.

II. DEMAND FOR HOUSING IN HAYWOOD COUNTY

The concept of demand for future housing units implies the willingness and ability of households to pay for housing desired, that is, what people are likely to do within the framework of present and changing incomes, tastes, prices, rents, construction costs, and mortgage terms. Housing market demand is considered to be made up of three distinct components:

1. Households. -- This component of housing market demand includes the housing units needed to accommodate households newly formed, or who leave units in which more than one family unit resided or who come to the housing market area from other places.
2. Replacement. -- In estimating housing market demand, it may be assumed that each unit withdrawn from the market will be replaced at some point during the projection period, though not necessarily at the same rent or price level.
3. Vacancies. -- The overall rate must be considered in the estimation of housing market potential. Estimates of vacant units are developed for the study projection period, based on population and household projections and past experience and future trends in construction.

The total of these segments of demand is the number of units which must be built over the projection period in order to satisfy the housing requirements of the population as of the end of that period.

Population and Household Growth

During the past decade, the population of Haywood County has increased by 4.95 percent (see Table 6). The population is expected to reach 45,158 by 1980. Household growth has been increasing at a much higher rate. Table 7 indicates the number of households formed since 1960 and the estimated number that will exist in 1980. The number of households has increased by 20.4 percent since 1960. This indicates a trend toward the formation of smaller households. It also creates a need for additional housing units.

The number of elderly households has been steadily increasing. It is expected that they will total 2,970 by 1980. As shown in Table 7, elderly households will comprise 18.7 percent of the households in Haywood County by the end of the decade.

TABLE 6
POPULATION GROWTH
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1950-1980

	Total Population	Migration	Natural Increase
1950	37,631	-	
1960	39,711	-10.5%	16.0%
1965	40,764	- 4.36	7.01
1970	41,710	- 2.63	4.95
1980 ^a	45,158	-	8.27

^aEstimated by the Division of Community Services

Source: North Carolina Department of Administration, Profile of North Carolina Counties, Third Edition (January, 1973).

TABLE 7
HOUSEHOLD GROWTH AND
NUMBER OF ELDERLY HOUSEHOLD
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1970-1980

	Number of Households	Percent Change	Numbers of Households With Head Over 64	Percent of Total
1970	13,228	20.4	1,847	13.9
1980	15,876	20.0	2,970	18.7

Source: Calculated from: Howard J. Sumka and Michael A. Stegman, The Housing Outlook in North Carolina: Projections to 1980 (June, 1972).
U. S. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Housing: 1970, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Final Report, North Carolina.

Employment and Income

In 1971, employment in Haywood County totaled 14,040 persons. Table 8 indicates recent employment statistics. Table 9 gives a breakdown of family income. The median family income for families within Haywood County was \$7,189 in 1970. Expected 1980 median family income in 1970 dollars for Region A (Haywood, Jackson, Macon, Swain, Graham, Clay, Cherokee) is \$6,558.⁶ Median income for Haywood County should be substantially higher than that of Region A. Table 10 shows the projected distribution of households in 1980 by income and number of persons for the county.

⁶Howard J. Sumka and Michael A. Stegman, The Housing Outlook in North Carolina: Projections to 1980 (June, 1972).

TABLE 8
EMPLOYMENT
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1962-1971

	Total Employment	Unemployment	Rate of Unemployment	Avg. Wkly. Earnings Per Worker
1962	12,970	660	4.8%	\$95.87
1963	12,820	690	5.1	98.03
1964	13,030	550	4.1	102.79
1965	13,010	550	4.1	103.37
1966	13,130	430	3.2	105.57
1967	13,420	430	3.1	109.50
1968	13,890	320	2.3	113.24
1969	14,090	290	2.0	117.96
1970	14,160	580	3.9	122.19
1971	14,040	470	3.2	129.21

Source: N. C. Department of Administration, Profile North Carolina Counties (1st ed., August, 1970; 2d ed., January, 1973).

TABLE 9
FAMILY INCOME
HAYWOOD COUNTY, 1970

Family Income	Number of Families by Family Income	Percentage in Each Family Income Bracket
Under \$1,000	338	2.91
1,000 - 1,999	759	6.53
2,000 - 2,999	798	6.86
3,000 - 3,999	827	7.12
4,000 - 4,999	822	7.07
5,000 - 5,999	1,042	8.96
6,000 - 6,999	1,019	8.78
7,000 - 7,999	1,097	9.44
8,000 - 8,999	1,003	8.63
9,000 - 9,999	912	7.84
10,000 - 11,999	1,250	10.74
12,000 - 14,999	1,061	9.13
15,000 - 24,999	579	4.98
25,000 - 49,999	102	.88
50,000 or more	15	.13

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, 1970.

TABLE 10
ESTIMATED 1980 DISTRIBUTION OF
HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME AND NUMBER OF PERSONS
HAYWOOD COUNTY

INCOME
(1970 DOLLARS)

Household Size	Less than 2,000	2,000- 3,999	4,000- 5,999	6,000- 7,999	8,000- 9,999	10,000- 14,999	15,000+	Total
1	675	468	308	153	66	35	17	\$1,722
2	775	1,148	1,306	785	356	270	165	4,806
3	284	447	618	834	684	370	145	3,386
4	145	288	480	706	471	390	141	2,833
5	82	162	265	390	387	227	79	1,592
6	<u>205</u>	<u>337</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>262</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>1,554</u>
TOTAL	\$2,166	\$2,850	\$3,414	\$3,130	\$2,315	\$1,406	\$612	\$15,876

Source: Calculated from: Howard J. Sumka and Michael A. Stegman,
The Housing Outlook in North Carolina: Projections to
1980 (June, 1972).

Housing Demand

The quantity and quality of housing which will be demanded according to tenure by the households in Haywood County at the end of the study period is shown in Tables 11 and 12.

TABLE 11

ESTIMATED 1980 RENTER HOUSEHOLDS
WITH ADEQUATE INCOMES BY
MONTHLY SHELTER COST^a AND NUMBER
OF PERSONS (RENTER DEMAND)
HAYWOOD COUNTY

MONTHLY COST
(1970 DOLLARS)

Size	Less than 30	30- 49	50- 69	70- 89	90- 119	120- 149	150+	Total
1	22	94	17	24	11	3	5	176
2	0	125	147	166	98	18	44	598
3	0	4	63	121	171	46	53	458
4	0	0	27	101	174	71	62	435
5	0	0	3	41	91	57	40	232
6	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>74</u>
TOTAL	22	223	257	459	567	218	227	1,973

Source: Calculated from: Howard J. Sumka and Michael A. Stegman,
The Housing Outlook in North Carolina: Projections
to 1980 (June, 1972).

^aContract rent plus utilities.

TABLE 12
ESTIMATED 1980 OWNER HOUSEHOLDS WITH ADEQUATE INCOMES
BY HOUSING VALUE AND NUMBER OF PERSONS (OWNER DEMAND)
HAYWOOD COUNTY
HOUSING VALUE
(1970 DOLLARS)

Household Size	Less than 5,000	5,000- 7,999	8,000- 10,999	11,000- 14,999	15,000- 19,999	20,000- 24,999	25,000+	Total
1	228	173	275	138	60	16	31	926
2	146	377	780	686	321	122	270	2,702
3	5	145	307	515	592	180	286	2,030
4	0	64	237	534	338	245	227	1,645
5	0	6	95	310	72	165	86	734
6	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>244</u>
TOTAL	379	770	1,709	2,273	1,398	793	959	8,281

Source: Calculated from: Howard J. Sumka and Michael A. Stegman,
The Housing Outlook in North Carolina: Projections to
1980 (June, 1972).

Housing Need

An estimate of housing need is designed to indicate the housing requirements of families, based on a minimum standard, without regard to the price of dwellings.

Housing need is a result of the following factors: (1) the number of substandard units; (2) the number of households living in crowded conditions; and (3) the number of households paying an excessive proportion of income for housing.

The great majority of households falling within this category are low and moderate income, elderly and minority group household groups which generally experience specific financial problems. Table 13 summarizes the need projections for 1980.

TABLE 13
ESTIMATED 1980 HOUSEHOLDS WITH
INADEQUATE INCOMES BY
MAXIMUM MONTHLY SHELTER COST AND
NUMBER OF PERSONS
(HOUSING NEED)
HAYWOOD COUNTY

Household Size	Less than 30	30- 49	50- 69	70- 89	90- 119	120+	Total
1	603	17	0	0	0	0	620
2	775	731	0	0	0	0	1,506
3	284	433	91	91	0	0	899
4	145	288	148	159	10	0	750
5	82	162	124	191	68	0	627
6	<u>205</u>	<u>337</u>	<u>219</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1,218</u>
TOTAL	2,094	1,968	582	770	197	9	5,620

Source: Calculated from: Howard J. Sumka and Michael A. Stegman,
The Housing Outlook in North Carolina: Projections to
1980 (June, 1972).

Total Housing Requirements

The combined number of units arising from demand and need factors constitute the total housing requirements for a given period. The gross housing demand is shown in Table 14.

Taken into consideration are removal of dilapidated structures, and removal of units from the market by choice, or natural causes, and an allowance for vacancies as well as demand and need factors. Of primary interest are the 4,554 additional units which will be required to meet the gross housing demand in 1980.

TABLE 14
GROSS HOUSING DEMAND ESTIMATED
1980
HAYWOOD COUNTY

Total Available Housing Units (November, 1972)		15,085
Currently Dilapidated Units	942	
Additional Loss	<u>402</u>	
	1,344	- 1,344
End of Period Standard Unit Vacancy Requirement (1% renter-occupied, 5% owner-occupied)		<u>- 358</u>
Carry-over From Existing Stock Remaining		<u>13,383</u>
Projected Housing Unit Requirements, 1980		17,937
Required New Units		<u>4,554</u>

Source: Division of Community Services.

III. FACTORS INHIBITING OPERATION OF THE HOUSING MARKET

It is evident that the operations have not enabled every household to obtain a decent dwelling in a suitable environment. A great many factors interfere with free operation of the housing market and thereby contribute to housing problems, particularly for low- and moderate-income households.

Restrictive Building and Housing Codes

Building codes may hamper efforts toward innovation in housing construction methods and materials, and thus contribute to the continuing housing shortage and increasing construction costs. Housing codes which are enforced without provision of adequate subsidies to aid low-income families while progressive in their intent are regressive in their effect. By the same token, these can be two of the best methods by which a community can assure good quality new construction and properly maintained dwellings. However, if these two instruments are to be used as tools for building a better community, continuous evaluation and updating must be conducted.

Zoning Enforcement

Zoning has long been recognized as a powerful tool for the protection of residential neighborhood and the creation of harmonious well-planned communities. It is important to avoid any negative uses of zoning to control housing development, to avoid fragmented administration of zoning, and to develop a zoning appeals process to insure compliance with county-wide goals and policies.

Obstructions Within the Tax Structure

The present burden of the property tax falls most heavily on lower income groups. In addition, the property tax, in effect, penalizes the property owners for maintaining or improving their property. It is recognized that local governments need funds to finance their activities, but heavy taxation of housing runs counter to the goal of upgrading the community's housing.

Failure of the Filtering Process

Though filtering is commonly regarded as a means for families to upgrade their accommodations without increasing the proportion of income spent for housing , this is seldom the case.

The National Commission on Urban Problems made the following analysis of this problem:

Misconceptions frequently obscure the problem of supplying decent housing, such as the notion that housing low-income families will take care of itself by the trickle-down or filter-down principle. This has it that as people move up the economic ladder, they leave behind them dwelling units which people moving up the ladder behind them can occupy. At the end of that chain of transferring residences, the poor in theory are provided with an inventory of available, lowest cost housing. Undeniably the trickle-down theory does work for part of the population, but it falls short of supplying enough housing for low-income families principally because: (1) the availability of the lowest cost housing is not always where the poor can get to it, and because (2) so much of the cheapest available housing is substandard, that is, lacking indoor plumbing and hot water, badly deteriorated, or overcrowded. In all conscience, housing that may have been suitable for one family cannot be counted as suitable when three or four families are sardined into it. Virtually, all slum housing is filter-down housing - which is proof enough of its inadequacy.⁷

⁷"Report of the National Committee on Urban Problems to the Congress and President of the United States," p. 11.

Land Speculation

In older residential areas land speculation not only raises the cost of land for new housing, but also contributes to the deterioration of existing dwellings. Although an actual need may exist for more commercial or industrial property in certain areas speculation tends to bring about excessive deterioration in the total environment of a neighborhood, thereby necessitating total rehabilitation or renewal.

Once the process of speculation has begun, only decisive action can prevent total disintegration of a neighborhood. Nothing is inevitable about deterioration of older areas. The very fact that deteriorated neighborhoods exist is simply an indication of apathy on the part of local officials who have stood by passively and allowed the areas to decline. Such inactivity makes holding property in declining neighborhoods continuously profitable, especially if the owner is able to influence their future redevelopment for commercial or industrial purposes. While holding such property and awaiting future developments to increase the value of an investment the owner may collect rent on his property, thereby providing a continuing long term cash income from his investment. He may also receive economic benefit by allowing any structures on the property to decline and subtracting this depreciation from his annual income, thus reducing his federal income tax payments. Finally any profits realized from the sale of his property are taxable as long term capital gains and as such are subject to much less tax. All these advantages mean that holding substandard housing in declining neighborhoods is profitable and will remain so unless government moves to make such activity a poor financial risk.

Many of the remedies, especially in the area of taxation, must be initiated at the national level. However, at least one solution can be provided locally. A land use plan is currently being prepared for the county. Upon completion of

this plan, there must be a commitment by local officials and citizens in general, to follow a course of action for the good of the community.

Public Facilities and Services

The availability of both public and private facilities and services is of considerable importance especially for the lower income, elderly, and partially disabled. Less likely to own a car, such households find themselves to be much more dependent upon their immediate environment for employment, shopping, and various other activities.

The calibre of public facilities and services which are available is also of major importance. To the extent that such services as police, fire, education, garbage collection, recreation, and many other public services are provided in a manner attuned to local needs, the adequacy of the neighborhood environment will be greatly enhanced.

Impact of Inflation

A significant constraint upon the free flow of the market is caused by the housing cost themselves (including land, financing, materials, and labor) which have been rising during the past several years. A growing number of households are therefore being forced to remain in their present unit or pay a higher proportion of income on housing.

In the case of conventional single family housing units approximately 61 percent of the construction cost is determined before the builder enters the picture. Thus, the areas in which the builder may actually influence the final cost of housing are relatively small.

Lack of Mortgage Financing

Because of poor credit, lack of savings for a down payment, job insecurity and a general lack of financial stability, lending institutions are reluctant to provide capital to low-income families.

IV. PUBLIC EFFORTS

In Haywood County there are two public housing authorities and a housing and development commission which are currently in operation.

The Canton Housing Authority received approval for 50 units of turnkey housing but has been unable to continue the project due to the current impoundment of federal funds. Turnkey housing is a federal program whereby private housing developers with appropriate sites, or site options submit proposals to the local housing authority to build low-rent public housing in accordance with their own plans and specifications. The local authority contracts to purchase the completed housing for use as low-rent housing for low-income families with federal annual contributions to be made to the housing.

The Waynesville Public Housing Authority began construction of 100 units of public housing in 1972 which will be completed in the near future. The project includes four building sites: Ninevah, Pigeon Street, Waynesville Junior High and Love Lane. The largest site being at Ninevah which will consist of 60 family units. A total of 60 units for housing the elderly will be distributed over the remaining three sites.

The Haywood County Housing and Development Commission is an incorporated non-profit organization which provides housing assistance to low-income families in the rural areas of the county. Its primary interest has been owner-occupied single family units.

The commission has recently begun the subdivision of a three-and-a-half acre site in the Gibsontown area near Canton. The purchase of the site was financed by a loan from the Farmer's Home Administration. Upon completion of

the subdivision, installation of utilities and development of roads, the lots will be sold and the loan repaid. This is the first of several projects which the commission hopes to initiate.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE HOUSING SITUATION

The housing delivery system is essentially a private system. The production, exchange and management of the county's housing are largely in private hands and are influenced by many factors beyond those in which local government plays a part. Thus, the improvement of housing conditions and the production of necessary low-and-moderate-income housing to meet the county's needs will necessitate the enlistment of the housing industry and the many community groups that are interested in housing.

On the other hand, virtually every area of local government responsibility-- for utilities, education, welfare, health, protection, and so forth -- has implications for housing development and availability. Policies relating directly to land development, property taxation, utility extension, and zoning may have the most obvious relevance to housing but they are only part of the total range of local governmental relationships to housing that are involved.

The primary objectives of a housing program are:

1. To insure that each resident regardless of income is provided a decent, safe and sanitary dwelling; and
2. To improve the overall living environment for all residents in the county.

The following recommendations are suggested to help Haywood County achieve these objectives:

Eliminate Incompatible Land Use

Incompatible land uses are uses of the land which, for a variety of reasons, are mutually antagonistic toward one another. Such uses are incapable of harmonious association or blending into a stable condition. Thus, areas where numerous incompatible land uses are found may properly be described as "zones of conflict."

Large numbers of substandard dwellings appear in areas where conflicting land usage is a major problem.

Regulate Subdivision Development

Many of the problems of poor subdivision development are at least in part bound up in the outmoded developmental pattern of the county. Residential development has moved from an era of single family dwelling construction into larger scale residential developments. Today virtually entire residential neighborhoods may be created by single developments. Considering the impact such developments have on a community, the need for regulation is greater now than ever before. However, a distinct line must be drawn between regulation and control if variety and high quality are to be achieved in new residential developments. Insuring maximum use of innovative land use techniques requires regulations with design flexibility; regulations which steer land development in desirable directions without placing it in a straight jacket of control. That is to say, regulation should be employed only to designate the broad framework development should follow, not to dictate specific details of design.

Conserve Sound Structures and Assure Quality Construction

The newer housing in Haywood County is basically sound; however, precautions should be taken to assure quality construction and proper maintenance of older structures which are more likely to become substandard through neglect. Structural improvement campaigns should be continually encouraged among owners of sound housing. Also, enforcement of the North Carolina Building Code and adoption of a minimum housing code, subdivision regulations, and zoning will insure that all new dwellings are properly constructed, free from blighting influences, and adequately served by facilities.

Rehabilitate Deteriorated Structures

Rehabilitation of deteriorated dwellings is the single greatest need of the housing program. There are 3,158 deteriorated residential structures in Haywood County.

Substantial rehabilitation is a term defined as follows: "A property will be considered substantially rehabilitated when its condition is improved from deteriorated or substandard to good condition."⁸

Scattered as well as concentrated zones of deterioration must be treated. This means that a program for the rehabilitation of deteriorated residential structures must be both broad and extremely flexible. Adoption of a housing code accompanied by proper inspection and enforcement, will provide the basic instrument for rehabilitation of deteriorated structures. However, there must be a constant awareness that without careful administration this policy can become a tremendous burden on the very families whose housing it is intended to improve.

Remove Dilapidated Structures

Within the county there are a number of dilapidated dwellings unfit for human habitation. It can be noted from Illustrations 1 and 2 that the degree to which dilapidated structures are a problem at a particular location varies widely. If sufficient replacement housing is made available, strict enforcement of a housing code can remove these structures from the market. Until relocation housing is made available to those families residing in dilapidated structures, the code should be applied to units as they become vacant.

⁸ U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Circular HPMC-FHA 4010.11 (December 30, 1971).

Other Redevelopment Actions

Any program of renewal aimed at rehabilitating individual dwellings without rehabilitating the environment in which they exist is doomed to failure from the start. New and rehabilitated dwellings will not long remain in standard condition unless these environmental factors which contributed to their original decline are soon removed. This means that the renewal program must encompass more than rehabilitation of dwellings. Noxious or incompatible uses of the land which detrimentally affect the living environment must be removed. Adequate water and sewer facilities, well planned and constructed streets and roads, good schools, and nearby shopping and recreation areas are a must for building stable residential neighborhoods. In essence what this means is that for residential renewal to have any lasting effect it must be broad enough in scope and comprehensive enough in its approach to eliminate many of the ills which caused the original decline of the area. A program which falls short of eliminating these environmental problems is at best only piecemeal in its approach and as such cannot possibly achieve long-range renewal. Thus, renewal is no trivial matter to be undertaken in a half-hearted manner using piecemeal methods. To be truly successful such an approach must be comprehensive in its attack on the problem and as such will be expensive; however, the alternative is continued decline.

Providing Dwellings All Families Can Afford

Housing currently being constructed by private enterprise is fulfilling the demand created by those with sufficient financial resources, and poor families generally have not had the resources necessary to enter this market without some form of assistance; furthermore, government has not moved fast enough to provide this assistance. Thus, families in Haywood County are

divided into two groups -- one to be served by the private market and the other to be served by someone else unnamed.

Some families could be housed at their own cost and with a minimum of governmental assistance assuming that their housing requirements could be brought into some kind of balance with their income. That is to say, if builders could be influenced to construct more low-cost housing, then a certain amount of the problem would be eliminated by bringing the market to these families. However, for the great majority of low-income families this is no solution. The private market simply cannot be brought to them no matter how drastic the price reductions. Thus, the only plausible long-range solution for housing these families appears to be finding methods of bringing them into the market. To accomplish this, subsidies of varying types and amounts must be made available for these families. The Federal government has been the primary source of such subsidies. Currently the Federal Administration has placed an 18-month freeze on nearly all new approvals for subsidized housing in order to take a lengthy look at the subsidized housing programs before making any decision on replacement of existing programs. Most of the programs affected are administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development although some programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture also were subjected to the holding action. It appears that the basic Federal Housing Administration program of mortgage insurance has not been effected.

The following was taken from the fifth of a series of messages by President Nixon on the state of the union.

...there has been mounting evidence of basic defects in some of our housing programs. It is now clear that all too frequently the needy have not been the primary beneficiaries of these programs; that the programs have been riddled with inequities,

and that the cost for each unit of subsidized housing produced under these programs has been too high.

In short, we shall be making far more progress than we have been, and we should now move to place our housing policies on a much firmer foundation.

That is why we suspended new activity under federal subsidized-housing programs effective January 5 of this year.

.....

One of my highest domestic priorities this year will be the development of new policies that will provide aid to genuinely needy families and eliminate waste.

A major housing study is now under way within the Government, under the direction of my Counselor for Community Development. Within the next six months, I intend to submit to the Congress my policy recommendations in this field, based upon the results of that study.⁹

A review of housing policy is currently underway at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Secretary invites interested groups and individuals to submit views on existing policies, and programs and suggestions for improvement. Communications should be addressed to: Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, Housing Policy Review Team, HUD, Washington, D. C. 20410.

⁹State of the Union - Part 5 of a Series, as quoted in "New Directions for Communities - Nixon's Blueprint," as sent to Congress on March 8, 1973, U. S. News and World Report, LXXIV (March 19, 1973), 89-90.

SUMMARY

It is painfully evident that many obstructions stand in the way of improved housing considering past activity and expected responses of private industry to household growth. A substantial need for standard housing which all families can afford will still exist in 1980. In the absence of significant public sector efforts, there will be an unmet need for 2,100 new dwelling units for low-income families. A total of 5,600 households will need some form of financial assistance in order to satisfy their housing need. If the housing situation of low-income families is to be improved, there can be no substitute for genuine opportunity. Positive action must be taken by local governments to provide that opportunity.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to the requirements and guidelines of the National Environmental Protection Act, the Council on Environmental Quality, the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the State Environmental Policy Act, the following is a summary of environmental considerations regarding the recommendations in this housing study.

1. Abstract. -- The quality of the existing housing stock within Haywood County is examined and various factors which influence housing are related to the projected future housing needs. Recommendations are made which if implemented would improve the living environment of the residents of the county.
2. Environmental Impact. -- The recommendations, if implemented, will have a favorable impact on the environment.
3. Adverse Environmental Effects. -- The recommendations, if implemented, will not create any adverse environmental impact.
4. Alternative. -- The alternative is to ignore the lack of an adequate quantity of standard housing to meet the needs of the residents of the county. This would lead to the continued decline of the housing in the county and all the adverse physical and social consequences which result from poor housing.
5. The Relationship Between Short Term Uses of Man's Environment and Maintenance of Long Term Productivity. -- These recommendations, if implemented, will serve to protect the environmental quality of the county. In addition, the illumination of the adverse effects resulting from poor housing will over the long run increase the productivity of man's environment.

6. Mitigation Measures to Minimize Impact.--It is recommended that a housing code be strictly enforced only if suitable relocation housing is made available. It is also recommended that any measures to improve the housing situation which are implemented should avoid imposing any hardship on those whom it is designed to help.
7. Irreversible Commitments of Resources.--The recommendations contained in this report do not involve the commitment of resources.
8. Federal, State and Local Environmental Controls.--All existing state and federal and county environmental controls currently being enforced will be applicable to the planning area.

[illegible]

HAYWOOD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA





HAYWOOD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

